

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION: PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS' LEVEL OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AND JOB SATISFACTION

Priti Sharma

Graduate Fellow

Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department
East Tennessee State University Johnson City, TN 37614

James Lampley

Associate Professor

Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department
Johnson City, TN 37614

Donald Good

Professor and Chair

Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37614

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study was to explore the topic of organizational communication in higher education and examine staff members' perceptions about their level of communication and job satisfaction in their workplaces. This study was also designed to test the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction by analyzing the significance of different dimensions of Communication Satisfaction with the view that satisfaction is multifaceted.

The results of the study indicated that gender differences and the number of years in service do not seem to make a significant difference in the level of satisfaction among staff members, but the level of education and job classification seem to make a significant difference in the level of satisfaction among staff members. There were strong positive relationships found among all 8 dimensions of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), which indicated that staff members when felt positive about 1 dimension of CSQ, also tended to feel positive about other dimensions of CSQ. A strong positive relationship and statistically significant correlation was found between overall communication satisfaction and job satisfaction scores, indicating that when staff members feel satisfied with communication in their workplace, they also tend to feel satisfied with their job in their workplace.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to explore organizational communication and examine the perceptions of staff members' level of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction (Full-time and part-time nonteaching employees of academic institution) in a single higher education institution. The study was also designed to test the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction by analyzing the significance of different dimensions of communication satisfaction with the view that satisfaction is multifaceted.

Several studies have discovered that communication satisfaction among employees occur at different levels based on the facets that contribute to the satisfaction level. Staff

members play a key role in impacting the well-being, success, and smooth functioning of their institutions. It is important to understand the potential factors influencing organizational communication satisfaction and job satisfaction because low levels of job satisfaction has been associated with low productivity. Because the roles that staff members and faculty play are different, this study is focused only on staff members' perceptions of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in their current work positions and the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Because the interest of this researcher is communication that occurs within the organization, for the purpose of this study the terms organizational communication and internal communication are used interchangeably to mean communication that

occurs among employees within the organization, in this case higher education institution.

To determine the level of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction among staff members at the participating institution of higher education, the following research questions were developed for this study.

Research Question 1:

Do staff members report they are satisfied with communication in their organizations to a significant extent?

Research Question 2:

Do staff members report they are satisfied with their jobs to a significant extent?

Research Question 3:

Is there a significant difference between male and female staff members' mean overall scores on the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire?

Research Question 4:

Is there a significant relationship between the level of communication satisfaction among staff members and the number of years of service in their current work positions?

Research Question 5:

Is there a significant differences in the overall scores on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire as compared by level of education achieved?

Research Question 6:

Is there a significant differences in the overall scores on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire as compared by job classification?

Research Question 7:

Are there significant relationships among the eight dimensions of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)?

Research Question 8:

Is there a significant relationship between overall communication satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (overall score on the eighth dimension of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire)?

RELATED LITERATURE

Communication in the workplace, also known as organizational communication, has existed from ancient times and is probably even more important in modern complex organizations. A number of changes have taken place in the process of communication mostly because of technology. The way employees communicate today compared to the way employees communicated in the last several

decades have also changed. We greatly advanced from the times of industrialization, assembly lines, long-term employment, cross functional work teams, early years of Internet and electronic mail to the current era influenced by globalization, terrorism, climate change, and changing demographics (Miller, 2015).

As organizations get more complex in structure and in the way they function, it becomes necessary to reevaluate the way organizational communication occurs to ensure that they function effectively. Whether it is exchanging task related information or relational information, we need to communicate with others in the organization. Proper communication helps improve function, meet the goals, and maintain relationships in organizations. Communication plays a vital role in the functioning of any organization, whether it is for business, nonprofit, educational, or government organizations.

Effective communication affects a wide variety of components in an organization and can aid in achieving greater success for the organization (Steingrimsdottir, 2011). Effective internal communication can help create a healthy atmosphere of motivation, trust, engagement, and sharing of thoughts and ideas freely (Moyer, 2011). Lack of effective communication may cause miscommunication and adversely affect the smooth functioning of the organization.

Goris (2007) explained that unlike mechanical systems that operate on electrical impulse, organizations are social-systems filled with different people and hence operate and function through communication. He discussed the characteristics of the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) developed by Hackman and Oldman (1976) and stated that it was unique as it specifies the match between the needs of an individual and characteristics of a particular job and at the same time it highlights the performance and satisfaction variables (Goris, Vaught, & Pettit, 2000).

The early models of communication concentrated on one-way flow and focused on the sender and not the receiver. One of the well-known models of this type is the Shannon and Weaver's (1949) S-M-C-R Model, which is a very basic model of communication that mainly highlights the exchange of information and focuses on the sender (communicationtheory.org, 2010). Over the years, many approaches and processes came into existence that highlighted various ways communication and management should occur based on how organizations should function for maximum effectiveness. The various approaches and processes used for organizational communications include classical, human relations, human resources, systems and cultural approaches (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Moyer, 2011). Today one or more elements of each of these approaches are visible in different types of organization.

Communication in organizations occur at three primary levels, interpersonal level (between supervisor-subordinate), between groups (coworkers), and at an organizational level (within the organization and with outside stakeholders and clients) (Communicationtheory.org, 2010). Communication in organizations takes place in three major forms, verbal, non-verbal and written (Ober, 2001). The direction that communication flows is generally guided by the structure of the organization or organizational hierarchy. It may occur from top-down, bottom-up, or horizontally and between individuals, within or between groups, or at an organizational level (Postmes, 2003). The downward communication involves supervisor to subordinate communication, upward communication involves communication from subordinate to supervisor, and horizontal communication involves communication with people (coworkers) at the same level. Communication among different departments is referred as cross-channel communication (Ober, 2001).

Some of the communication that takes place in organization is formal, while other is informal. Formal communication is dictated by the formal structure of the organization, while informal communication does not follow any particular guideline (Postmes, 2003). Informal communication, also referred to as the grapevine, occurs in organizations through nonofficial channels (Ober, 2001). Communication in organizations occurs both internally, which is within the organization, and externally, which is outside of organization, and with outside stakeholders (Communicationtheory.org, 2010).

Research on communication in the workplace has often focused on interpersonal relationships that include the process of forming and maintaining relationships (Postmes, 2003). When studying the content of communication, it is often the case that the communication about the process and task at hand, communication about the policy and regulation, and communication dealing with human and rational factors are all considered as separate categories. Because each of the categories emphasizes different factors of organization, different approaches and style of communication may be appropriate.

Previous theorists and scholars have focused their research on organizational communication based on the sender or transmitter of the message or information, which later changed to focus on the receiver. Winska (2010) found that between 1950 and 1970 much of the research focused on vertical hierarchy, the downward and top-down communication. Also, much of the research in the area of organizational communication, supervisor-subordinate communication, or internal communication have mainly been focused on the supervisors' or employers' communication and communication skills, as opposed to subordinates' or

employees' communication competence or communication competence of both supervisor and subordinate as seen from both perspectives. Over time communication has changed from merely being a one-way, top-down flow to a two-way or multidirectional flow with increased use of informal communication among employees. This type of communication emphasizes human needs as one of the important aspect of a well-functioning organization.

Three prominent models that came into existence in the late 1800s and early 1900s played a role in developing a better understanding about organizational communication as well as human needs and behaviors was Taylor's 1911 Principles of Scientific Management that emphasized importance of task and matching job with workers (1947); Fayol's 1949 Classical Management Theory that highlighted the importance of a highly structured organization; and Weber's 1947 Theory of Bureaucracy that emphasized the importance of rules, authority, power, and discipline (Miller, 2015).

The importance of human relationships in workplaces was recognized as crucial and became an important component in organizational functioning through the popular Hawthorne Studies conducted by Elton Mayo in 1933 (Moyer, 2011). Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1943) also played an important role in emphasizing human needs that can also be applied to workplace settings (Miller, 2015). Based on the Motivation-Maintenance Model developed by Frederick Herzberg, two sets of factors or conditions known as hygiene or maintenance factors and motivators affect how employees behave in workplaces and how they affect their satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels (Drafke, 2006).

Among the types of communication channels or mediums, face-to-face communication have been seen as the richest channel (Byrne & LeMay, 2006; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Moyer, 2011) and according to Byrne and LeMay (2006) when receiving information from supervisors, employees perceived greater satisfaction when face-to-face communication was used. Extensive use of communicating through e-mail has been associated with lower levels of job satisfaction among employees (Merten & Gloor, 2009).

Hecht (1978) described communication satisfaction as an enjoyable socio-emotional result that employees derive from interacting with others. Pettit, Goris, and Vaught (1997) highlight a key point of the importance of employee communication satisfaction by linking it with the organizational effectiveness. In a study at an Australian retail organization, subordinate communication and supervisory communication was found to be the areas where the employees experienced most satisfaction (Gray & Laidlaw, 2002). On the other hand, Ahmad (2006) studied subor-

dinate and supervisory communication and found media quality and horizontal communication as areas of high satisfaction perceived by the employees. Madlock (2008) highlighted the importance of supervisor communication competence as a strong predictor of communication and job satisfaction among the employees. Among the classifications of job, Ramirez (2012) found that among the various levels of employees, student workers experienced highest level of satisfaction, while managers experienced the lowest level of job satisfaction.

Earlier studies often concentrated on the overall communication when evaluating the quality of communication in organizations, instead of treating communication in organizations as a combination of multiple facets. According to Miller a multifaceted approach to understanding the changing world is needed when studying organizational communication (Miller, 2015). Downs and Hazen (1977) stated a similar belief that communication satisfaction is multifaceted.

The level of content individuals perceive about their job, whether considering overall or individual facets is what Spector (1997) referred to as job satisfaction. From past research, it appears that job satisfaction has been studied from mainly the employees' perspective. Task related factors and communication, including interpersonal relations, are strong components that could influence job satisfaction (Zeffane, 1994). The top seven factors influencing the level of job satisfaction among employees found by SHRM Report (2012) are opportunities to use skills and abilities, job security, compensation or pay, communication between employees and senior management, relationship with immediate supervisor, benefits, organization's financial stability, and the work itself.

Several research studies on communication satisfaction have been linked to job satisfaction (Pettit, Goris, & Vaught, 1997; Pincus, 1986). Among other factors, leadership style has been associated with employees' satisfaction level in their organizations. The competence of the supervisor in communication has been found to affect employees' level of job and communication satisfaction (Madlock, 2008). Pincus (1986) discovered that supervisor communication, communication climate, personnel feedback, and top management communication are essentials elements needed for job satisfaction among nurses. When studying individual facets of job satisfaction and comparing it with the overall communication satisfaction, Goris, Pettit, and Vaught (1997) found that employees associated work, supervision, pay, promotion, coworkers, and overall satisfaction with communication satisfaction. It is common to find studies where organizational communication and job satisfaction have either been considered as an overall component or broken down

into individual facets (Pettit, Goris, & Vaught, 1997; Madlock, 2008; Pincus, 1986).

Among the scales used to measure communication satisfaction, Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) developed by Downs and Hazen (1977) is the most widely used scale across different types of organizations (Alsayed, Motaghi, & Osman, 2012; Gray & Laidlaw, 2004; Jones, 2006; Ramirez, 2012). Through test-retest, the reliability was reported at $r = .94$. Construct validity of the CSQ has been determined primarily through factor analysis, discovering eight factors contributing to communication satisfaction among employees (Downs & Hazen, 1977). Downs and Hazen developed eight dimensions through factor analysis that contribute to communication satisfaction among employees. The eight dimensions are communication climate, relationship with superiors, organizational integration, media quality, horizontal and informal communication, organizational perspective, relationship with subordinates, and personal feedback.

Job satisfaction has been studied either as the global overall measure or has been considered as being composed of several individual facets that measure job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), and modified versions of the original JDI, known as The Job in General, The Abridged Job Descriptive Index, and Abridged Job in General are some of the widely used scales for measuring job satisfaction among employees that either considers global measure of job satisfaction or evaluates job satisfaction based on individual facets of job satisfaction.

Academic organizations or higher education institutes serve a great number of individuals from diverse backgrounds and roles. To function effectively some mode of communication is essential that not only transmits the message or information but also considers its impact on employees along with its effectiveness. As higher education institutions change in the way they are structured, the way they function, especially with both virtual and on ground format, and the changes in demographics, they require constant evaluating of their communication practices to maintain and improve their effective functioning and building effective relationships with individuals they serve.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

Approximately 2,600 staff members across three different campuses of a single institution in Northeast Tennessee

comprised the population. For this study nonteaching staff were included (no faculty members were used). The sample included a wide variety in terms of gender, number of years in service, education level, and job classification. The participants also represented a wide range of departments. The institution is a public 4-year institution that offers undergraduate, professional, graduate, and doctoral programs in a variety of fields. Approximately 15,000 students are currently enrolled at this institution. The non-random sample used for this study included both full-time and part-time staff members from various job classifications. Some of the classifications used in this study based on the information derived from institution's Fact Book 2013 and information from Human Resources Office were Executive Administration and Managerial, Professional Non-Faculty, Clerical and Secretarial, Technical & Paraprofessional, Skilled crafts, Maintenance, Service workers, and Student workers and Graduate Assistants.

Instrumentation

This research study was conducted using a modified version of a widely used Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) developed by Downs and Hazen (1977) and has been shown to be consistent and reliable across organizations. The original CSQ included 40 statements from eight dimensions with five statements in each dimension. Data were collected from a single higher education institution. The modified survey for this study included 36 statements and five demographic questions. The survey was used to collect relevant information about staff member's perception about their level of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. The survey was a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 being strongly dissatisfied and a 7 being strongly satisfied. The survey was designed based on eight dimensions. The original CSQ included eight communication satisfaction dimensions, out of which seven were used in this study. The eighth dimension that focused on supervisor's perspective was omitted and replaced with a new dimension named job satisfaction. The focus of this study is communication and job satisfaction from subordinate or employee perspective.

The job satisfaction dimension included eight statements that were developed by the researcher and created based on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) and the SHRM Report (2012). From the original CSQ, 15 statements were omitted, 11 new were added. Some of the statements used minor modification in the way they were worded to fit the needs of the particular group being studied. All the dimensions included three to five statements each, except the eighth dimension, which included eight statements. An introductory paragraph about the research was included in the survey.

The survey was calculated to take less than 15 minutes to complete.

Data Collection

The survey was distributed through SurveyMonkey, an online survey service. A paper version of the survey was distributed to selected groups at the participating institute to increase the return rate. The participants were advised that their responses and identity will remain confidential and that they were free to stop participating in the survey at any time.

FINDINGS

Research Question 1

A one-sample t test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 1 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 1 (Personal Feedback) 5.14 ($SD = 1.43$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(398) = 15.94, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction personal feedback dimension ranged from 1.00 to 1.28. The effect size ($d = 0.80$) indicated a large effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with personal feedback.

A one-sample t test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 2 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 2 (Relationship to Supervisors) 5.41 ($SD = 1.44$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(366) = 18.79, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction personal feedback dimension ranged from 1.27 to 1.56. The effect size ($d = 0.98$) indicated a large effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with relationship to supervisors.

A one-sample t test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 3 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 3 (Horizontal and Informal Communication) 5.19 ($SD = 1.30$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(365) = 17.60, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction horizontal and informal communication dimension ranged from 1.06 to 1.32. The effect size ($d = 0.92$) indicated a large effect. The results indicated that participants were

generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with horizontal and informal communication.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 4 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 4 (Organizational Integration) 5.21 ($SD = 1.19$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(393) = 20.13, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction organizational integration dimension ranged from 1.09 to 1.33. The effect size ($d = 1.02$) indicated a large effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with organizational integration.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 5 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 5 (Organizational Perspective) 4.92 ($SD = 1.37$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(399) = 13.43, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction organizational perspective dimension ranged from 0.78 to 1.05. The effect size ($d = 0.67$) indicated a medium effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied with organizational perspective.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 6 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 6 (Communication Climate) 4.91 ($SD = 1.52$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(368) = 11.43, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction communication climate dimension ranged from 0.75 to 1.06. The effect size ($d = 0.60$) indicated a medium effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied with communication climate.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 7 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 7 (Media Quality) 5.25 ($SD = 1.37$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(359) = 17.40, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the communication satisfaction media quality dimension ranged from 1.11 to 1.39. The effect size ($d = 0.92$) indicated a large effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with media quality. The results of all the communication satisfaction dimensions indicated that staff members are generally satisfied with the communication in their workplace.

Research Question 2

A one-sample *t* test was conducted on the mean scores for Dimension 8 of CSQ to determine whether the mean was significantly different from 4, the mid-point of the Likert-type scale. The sample mean for Dimension 8 (Job Satisfaction) 5.43 ($SD = 1.20$) was significantly higher than 4, which represented neutrality, $t(359) = 22.60, p < .001$. The 95 % confidence interval for the mean scores on the job satisfaction dimension of CSQ ranged from 1.31 to 1.56. The effect size ($d = 1.19$) indicates a large effect. The results indicated that participants were generally somewhat satisfied to satisfied with job satisfaction dimension. The results indicated that staff members are generally satisfied with their job in their workplace.

Research Question 3

An independent samples *t* test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean overall scores on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) differed significantly among female and male staff members. The mean overall scores (Dimension 1 through Dimension 8 of CSQ) was the test variable and the grouping variable was female staff members or male staff members. The test was not significant, $t(315) = .36, p = .722$. Therefore, $H_{0.3}$ was retained. The η^2 index was $<.01$ which indicated a small effect. The female staff members ($M = 5.26, SD = 1.22$) tended to score about the same as the male staff members ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.19$) on the CSQ. The 95% confidence interval for the differences in means was -.24 to .35.

Research Question 4

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed between the mean scores (overall scores from Dimension 1 through Dimension 8) on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) and the number of years of service to test the relationship between the level of communication satisfaction among staff members and the number of years of service in their current work positions. The results of the correlation analysis revealed a weak negative relationship between the mean scores on CSQ ($M = 5.25, SD = 1.21$) [$r(317) < .01, p = .361$]. Therefore, $H_{0.4}$ is retained. In general, the results suggest that the staff members' mean scores on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire is not related to the number of years in service.

Research Question 5

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between total overall mean scores of staff members on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire and the highest level of education achieved by the staff

members. The factor variable, the highest level of education achieved by the staff members, included five levels (High school diploma, Some college, Undergraduate degree, Graduate degree, and Doctorate degree or higher). The dependent variable was the total overall mean scores of staff members on CSQ (Dimension 1 through Dimension 8). The ANOVA was significant, $F(4, 312) = 3.57, p = .007$. The strength of the relationship between the total overall mean scores of staff members and the highest level of education achieved by the staff members as assessed by η^2 was small (.04).

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons was conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the five groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variance was assumed. There was a significant difference in the means of the group that received some college and the group that achieved graduate degree ($p = .033$), and between the group that achieved a graduate degree and the group that achieved doctorate degree or higher ($p = .044$). However, there was not a significant differences in the means of the groups that achieved high school diploma and the groups that received some college ($p = .869$); the group that achieved high school diploma and the group that achieved undergraduate degree ($p = .984$); the group that achieved high school diploma and the group that achieved doctoral degree or higher ($p = .709$); the group that received some college and the group that achieved undergraduate degree ($p = .908$); The group that received some college and the group that achieved doctoral degree or higher ($p = .981$); the group that achieved undergraduate degree and the group that achieved graduate degree ($p = .069$); and the group that achieved undergraduate degree and the group that achieved doctoral degree or higher ($p = .715$). It appears that receiving high school diploma or some college, high school diploma or undergraduate degree, high school diploma or graduate degree,

high school diploma or doctorate degree or higher, some college or undergraduate degree, or some college and doctorate degree or higher, undergraduate degree or graduate degree, and undergraduate degree or doctorate or higher degree, are equally responsible for achieving higher scores on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (for perceiving higher communication satisfaction in the workplace among staff members). The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as, the means and standard deviations for the five levels of education group, are reported in Table 1.

Research Question 6

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between job satisfaction and the total overall mean scores of staff members on Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ). The factor variable job classification included five levels: Executive, Administrative, Managerial (Group 1), Professional Non Faculty (Group 2), Clerical and Secretarial (Group 3), Technical, Skilled, Maintenance, Service, Others (Group 4), and Student Worker, Tuition Scholar, Graduate Assistant (Group 5). The dependent variable was the difference in the total mean scores of staff members on the CSQ (Dimensions 1 through Dimensions 8). The ANOVA was significant, $F(5, 311) = 4.65, p < .001$. The strength of the relationship between job classification and the total mean scores on CSQ as assessed by η^2 was small (.07).

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the five groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant differences in the means between the professional Non Faculty group and the Student Worker, Tuition Scholar, Graduate Assistant group ($p = .008$) and the

TABLE 1 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS WITH 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS OF PAIRWISE DIFFERENCES							
Level of Education	N	M	SD	High School	Some College	Undergrad	Graduate
High School	13	5.16	1.26	-1.37 to .66	-.37 to .72	-.02 to .84	-1.48 to .01*
Some College	51	5.51	1.27	-1.14 to .77	.03 to 1.14*	-1.06 to .39	
Undergrad	121	5.34	1.16	-.73 to 1.19	-9.7 to .65		
Graduate	108	4.93	1.21	-1.65 to .60			
Doctorate/ Higher	24	5.68	1.02				

**. Significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Clerical and Secretarial group and the Student Worker, Tuition Scholar, Graduate Assistant group ($p < .001$). However, there was not a significant differences in the means between the Executive, Administrative, Managerial group and the Professional Non Faculty group ($p = .535$); the Executive, Administrative, Managerial group and the Clerical and Secretarial group ($p = .220$); the Executive, Administrative, Managerial group and the Technical, Skilled, Maintenance, Service, and Others group ($p = .934$); the Executive, Administrative, Managerial group and the Student Worker, Tuition Scholar, Graduate Assistant group ($p = .998$); the Professional Non Faculty group and the Clerical and Secretarial group ($p = .957$); the Professional Non Faculty group and the Technical, Skilled, Maintenance, Service, and Others group ($p = .999$); the Clerical and Secretarial group and the Technical, Skilled, Maintenance, Service, and Others group ($p = .941$); and the Technical, Skilled, Maintenance, Service, and Others group and the Student Worker, Tuition Scholar, Graduate Assistant group ($p = .627$). It appears that Group 1 or Group 2, or Group 1 or Group 3, Group 1 or Group 4, Group 1 or Group 5, Group 2 or Group 3, Group 2 or Group 4, Group 3 or Group 4, and Group 4 or Group 5, are equally responsible in affecting the mean scores of the staff members on the CSQ. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as, the means and standard deviations for the five job classification groups, are reported in Table 2.

Research Question 7

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed among the eight Dimensions of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ). Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type I error across the 28 correlations, a p value of less than .002 (.05/28 = .002) was required for significance. The results of the analysis revealed strong positive relationships among all eight Dimensions with

the strength of the relationship ranging from $r = .67$ to $r = .88$ and p values all $< .001$ (Table 3). All the relationships were positive and strongly related, therefore high score on one Dimension tended to produce higher scores on other Dimensions. Table 3 displays the bivariate correlations among dimension 1 through dimension 8 of CSQ.

Research Question 8

A Pearson correlation coefficient was conducted to evaluate the relationship between staff members overall communication satisfaction score (Dimension 1 through Dimension 7) with their overall job satisfaction score (Dimension 8) of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. The results of the correlational analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between Communication Satisfaction ($M = 144.53$, $SD = 35.07$) and Job Satisfaction ($M = 43.35$, $SD = 9.70$) and a statistically significant correlation [$r(299) = .88$, $p < .001$]. In general, the results suggest that the staff members that perceive being satisfied with communication in their workplace also tend to perceive being satisfied with their job.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the comparison of previous research and the present study, the results support the concept that communication satisfaction is a multidimensional as found by Downs and Hazen (1977), and that each dimension contributes to the level of communication satisfaction among employees. Previous research by Mueller and Lee (2002) revealed that full-time employees (respondents) of nonprofit organizations perceived moderate amounts of communication satisfaction in their workplaces for all the communication satisfaction dimensions. The results of the same study also indicated that Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) played a key role in positively affecting subordinates' perceptions of communication satisfaction in each

TABLE 3
BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS AMONG DIMENSION 1 THROUGH DIMENSION 8 OF CSQ

Dimensions	Dim1	Dim2	Dim3	Dim4	Dim5	Dim6	Dim7
Dim2: Relationship to Supervisors	.85**						
Dim3: Horizontal and Informal Communication	.73**	.80**					
Dim4: Organizational Integration	.86**	.78**	.74**				
Dim5: Organizational Perspective	.71**	.69**	.72**	.80**			
Dim6: Communication Climate	.82**	.86**	.87**	.82**	.80**		
Dim7: Media Quality	.78**	.87**	.87**	.76**	.73**	.88**	
Dim8: Job Satisfaction	.80**	.85**	.82**	.79**	.67**	.83**	.82**

**. Correlation is significant at a .01 level (2-tailed).

Dim1-, Dim2-, Dim3-, Dim4-, Dim5-, Dim6-, Dim7-, and Dim8

of interpersonal, group, and organizational contexts (all dimensions of communication satisfaction). The higher the quality of LMX, the higher communication satisfaction among subordinates was indicated. A previous study found that the composite mean scores for each of the communication satisfaction dimensions were all calculated to be above the mid-point of four for their employees which indicated they were at least somewhat satisfied in each dimensions of communication satisfaction (Jones, 2006).

The following recommendations should be considered to improve practice.

1. Research on the topic of organizational communication practice, communication satisfaction and job satisfaction among staff members could be conducted over a long period of time to see if similar perceptions are maintained or changed in order to get a better understanding of what factors contribute the most to communication satisfaction for staff members. This knowledge could be used to develop effective strategies for future.
2. Effective communication is crucial for many aspects of the organization's proper functioning. Constant and ongoing evaluation of effective approaches and creating a communication practice plan for the organization's departments or units (higher education institution) through collaboration with other members of the organization at all levels can aid in effective communication practices. The supervisors can provide better communication practices by creating open-door policy, more face-to-face communication opportunities, use of different mediums or channels of communication, trust, conveying feedback, and opportunities for their subordinates (staff) to interact, contribute, and participate in the process for improvement and coming up with solutions.
3. A communication plan or procedure can be a great asset for improving the functioning of the organization. Similar strategies for effective communication by different units of the organization can aid in the overall effectiveness of the functioning of the organization. Receiving right amount of information through two-way communication, having a

TABLE 2 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS WITH 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS OF PAIRWISE DIFFERENCES							
Job Category	N	M	SD	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Group 1	23	5.49	1.06				
Group 2	80	5.02	1.28	-.33 to 1.27	-.39 to .72	-.18 to .61	-1.31 to .39
Group 3	68	4.85	1.34		-.10 to .76	-.26 to .24**	
Group 4	18	5.14	1.15		-.71 to 1.41	-.07 to -.10*	
Group 5	121	5.60	1.01		-.88 to .65		

**. Significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

good communication flow through appropriate channels of communication, and receiving personal feedback can aid in higher satisfaction in communication and job satisfaction. To make this possible, the organizational leaders could emphasize using clear and consistent information to improve the internal communication process that currently exists in their organizations.

4. It is important for both supervisors and subordinates to understand each other, listen, communicate, and maintain a positive and healthy relationship. Organizations can improve communication by providing opportunities for training programs and workshops for continues improvement with the focus on effective communication and leadership skills. By providing more collaboration opportunities at all levels, organizations can improve relationships that can help improve professional relationships.
5. The higher education institution that participated in this study found that its staff members were for the most part somewhat satisfied to satisfied for all the dimensions of communication satisfaction except organizational perspective and communication climate, where they were found to be somewhat satisfied. The institution's leaders should develop strategies and update policies and procedures by adding clear information and updates based on the needs and areas of concern, to keep employees (staff members) well-informed.
6. The leader of each unit or department should facilitate communication by creating an opportunity for staff to come together and collaborate on the needs, understanding of the existing policies, and design a plan for communication improvement based on the suggestions and concerns presented. A well-thought strategy based on the needs, accomplishments, resources, and past failures and successes can help create an environment where everyone works towards a common goal and perceive themselves to be part of a team. Leaders could send out information through a monthly or quarterly newsletter about the accomplishments, recognition, and state of the department. Also, they could create opportunities for group collabora-

tion for departmental projects to help built healthy and positive co-worker relationships.

7. Communication satisfaction has been shown to be crucial for job satisfaction. The results from this study found that communication satisfaction and job satisfaction has a direct relationship. Keeping this in mind, the supervisors can educate their individual units or departments on the importance of effective communication. By creating an environment of open communication, organizations can create an effective workplace.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, A. (2006). Auditing communication satisfaction among academic staff: An approach to managing academic excellence, *The Business Review*, 5(1). 330-333.

Alsayed, A. K., Motaghi, H. M., & Osman, I. B. (2012). The relationship between communication satisfaction and performance indicators in Palestinian governmental organization, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*, 2(11)

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Byrne, Z. S., & LeMay, E. (2006). Different media for organizational communication: Perceptions of quality and satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(2), 149-173. doi: 10.1007/s10869-006-9023-8

Communicationtheory.org (2010). Communication theory: Kinds (Types) employed by business organisations. Retrieved from <http://communicationtheory.org/kinds-types-of-communication-employed-by-business-organisations/>

Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14, 63-73.

Drafke, M. (2006). *The Human side of organizations* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*, (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.

Goris, J. R., Vaught, B. C., & Pettit, J. D. (2000). Effects of communication direction on job performance and satisfaction: A moderated regression analy-

sis. *Journal of Business Communication*, 37(4), 348-367. doi: 10.1177/002194360003700402

Goris, J. R. (2007). Effects of satisfaction with communication on the relationship between individual-job congruence and job performance/satisfaction, *Journal of Management Development*, 26(8), 737-752. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621710710777255>

Gray, J., & Laidlaw, H. (2002). Part-time employment and communication satisfaction in an Australian retail organization. *Employee Relations*, 24(2), 211-228. doi: 10.1108/01425450210420929

Gray, J., & Laidlaw, H. (2004). Improving the measurement of communication satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17(3), 425-448. doi: 10.1177/0893318903257980

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2) 250-270.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, C. T. (2006). In search of communication satisfaction at the state bar of Georgia. Thesis, Georgia State University, 2006. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=communication_theses

Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45, 61-78. doi: 10.1177/0021943607309351

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.

Merten, F., & Gloor, P. (2009). Too much E-mail decreases job satisfaction. Collaborative Innovation Networks Conference 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/procedia>

Miller, K. (2015). *Organizational communication: Approaches and process* (7th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage.

Moyer, J. (2011). Employee/organizational communications. *Institute for Public Relations*. Retrieved from <http://www.instituteforpr.org/employee-organizational-communications/>

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-MSQ. Retrieved from <http://www.psych.umn.edu/psychlabs/vpr/msqinf.htm>

Ober, S. (2001). *Contemporary business communication* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Pettit, J. D., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B. C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34(1), 81-98. doi: 10.1177/002194369703400105

Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. *Human Communication Research*, 12 (3), 395-419.

Postmes, T. (2003). A social identity approach to communication in organizations. In S. A. Haslam, D. van Knippenberg, M. J. Platow, & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice* (pp. 81-98). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Ramirez, D. L. (2012). Organizational communication satisfaction and job satisfaction within university foodservice (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://krex.k-state.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2097/14123/danielramirez2012.pdf?sequence=1>

Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). The mathematical theory of communication, Urbana, University of Illinois Press. Retrieved from <http://communicationtheory.org/shannon-and-weaver-model-of-communication/>

Smith, P. C., Kendall, M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Steingrimsdottir, H. (2011). The relationship between internal communication & job satisfaction: A case study. *Copenhagen Business School: Marketing Communication Management*. Retrieved from http://studenttheses.cbs.dk/bitstream/handle/10417/3240/hrund_steingrimsdottir.pdf?sequence=1

Taylor, F. W. (1947). *The principles of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1911).

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis: University, Industrial Relation Center.

Winska, J. (2010). Influence of superior-subordinate communication on employee satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Management*, 1(1), 110-124.

Zeffane, R. M. (1994). Correlates of job satisfaction and their implication for work redesign: A focus on the Australian telecommunications industry. *Public Personnel Management*, 23(1), 61-76.